DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 222 JC 790 169

TITLE Selected Papers from the Conference on Small/Rural Colleges.
PUB DATE 4 Aug 78
NOTE 79p.; Papers presented at the National Conference on Small/Rural Colleges (1st, Blacksburg, Virginia, August 4, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Administration; Community Colleges; Community Services; Curriculum Development; *Educational Finance; Institutional Characteristics; *Junior Colleges; Research Needs; *Rural Schools; School District Autonomy; *Small Colleges; State School District Relationship; Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

Selected papers from a conference on small/rural colleges are presented. Two separate presentations discuss the financing of small/rural community colleges. In two other papers, one by J. Wade Gilley and the other by Gerald E. James and Elton Collier Aycock, the positive and negative aspects of state coordination and control of local colleges are probed. Richard E. Wilson reviews the institutional and student characteristics related to the approximately 500 rural community colleges as compared to those of the total of 1,235 colleges listed in the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' directory. In another paper, George B. Vaughan presents a philosophical overview with practical implications regarding curriculum comprehensiveness in times of limited resources. A series of recommendations from the conference are included on the following concerns: (1) organization and management; (2) initiating and maintaining comprehensive student development programs; (3) community services; (4) financing small/rural community colleges; (5) state coordination and control; (6) staff development; (7) curriculum comprehensiveness; (8) research in small/rural colleges; and (9) equal opportunity and the rural community college. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED167222

SELECTED PAPERS FROM THE CONFERENCE ON SMALL/RURAL COLLEGES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Herbert Phillips

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 169

Financing Small/Rural Community Colleges
A Bigger Share of the Pie

Presented at the First Annual Conference
of Small/Rural Community/Junior Colleges
Blacksburg, Virginia 1978
by
J. Thomas Mills, Jr.

Martorana and Morrison (1962), using financial statistics on higher education by the National Center for Educational Statistics, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, compiled the mean percentage distribution of financial support for community college operations nationwide in 1955-56 and again for 1973-74.

More recently, Wattenbarger, teamed with Cage in 1974 and Starnes in 1976, conducted surveys of practices in financing community colleges in several states. The 1976 report, which covers community college systems in thirty-four states, itemizes dollar amounts received in 1975-76 from each of the major sources of income.

The Martorana and the Wattenbarger and other studies clearly indicate the shifting of responsibilty for funding community colleges.

In comparing these studies several observations may be made. First, the community and junior colleges have essentially remained true to their commitment to keep the cost of attendance at a minimum, as indicated by the fact that the percentage of income derived from student tuition and fees was not substantially different in 1975-76 from what it was in 1955-56.

Secondly, local tax support is disappearing, and states and the federal government are contributing proportionately more to the financing of community colleges, directly through institutional support and indirectly through student financial aid. The federal government support is primarily through student financial aid.

The shifts in sources of support for community colleges are not the results of happenstance. They reflect changing public policy positions taken on the broad issue of support for higher education, and they parallel trends in legislation at the local, state and federal levels.

Federal and state agencies and the public-at-large are talking about topics such as overinvestment in community college education, declining enrollment, prospective staff surplus, budget reductions, students inadequately prepared for work or for further eudcation, and declining rates of institutional productivity.

The approval of California Proposition 13 and similar efforts, which reportedly are already underway in twenty-five other states, in my opinion, has and will continue to have, far-reaching direct and indirect effects on the financing of community colleges throughout the country.

Although this particular action deals primarily with property tax limitations, it is in my opinion serving notice to legislators who are beginning to voice and express their concern by reducing current taxes or refusing to pass additional taxes. Some observers called the reduction of 1.8 billion from an appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare a political response to the vote in California.

The taxpayers revolt has prompted a hiring freeze and elimination of salary increases and the talk of the imposition of tuition charges for the first time in California's history.

Higher education officials in those states where efforts are being made to place property tax limitation on the ballot are considering what they might do if such measures are approved, and the subject was among the worries of a recent meeting of the southern governors and educators as they debated the future of higher education in this region.

Although the trend has been for state governments to assume more and more of the cost of community college operation, the level of funding has been static or increasing below the inflation rate, which in effect is a reduction of effective funds. With reduced revenues to local and state governments, monies normally allocated to community colleges will of necessity be siphoned off to pick up the cost of other services to the citizenry.

Several factors working singly or in combination, which have caused short-falls in operating budgets in community colleges, were suggested by Richard L. Alfred in the editors notes to the 1978 summer edition of New Directions for Community Colleges. These have been modified somewhat and are listed here because they must be considered in developing strategies for acquiring and utilizing operational funds:

- The general inflationary condition of the economy, (particularly rising energy costs on the operating budgets of community colleges);
- The decline in the traditional college-age population, and the declining motivation of college-aged youth for post-secondary education because of slackening job market and availability of career training programs outside of higher education. Thus, fluctuating or unpredictable enrollment;
- The trend of state and federal governments toward financing higher education through student financial aid programs rather than to the institution, thus allowing the student the option as to where he or she is going to spend it, and because the financial aid is based on educational cost at particular institutions, students may elect to attend the more "prestigious" four-year institution with little or no additional cost to the individual, thus, contributing to declining enrollments in community colleges;

- Funding formulas that limit or prohibit support for non-traditional students;

- The competion of other public institutions for scarce resources because of organizational constraints such as a weak or ineffective lobby, a transient student population, alumni who are unaccessible or uninterested in community college affairs, political contacts that are limited to the local community, and funding policies that tie the college too stringently to local tax support;

- The changing job market and the loss of public confidence in higher education as an iron-clad guarantee of a job;

- The impact of proprietary schools and four-year colleges competing against community colleges for the same students;

- The resistance of the general public to committing new or unused resources to higher education; and

- The movement toward collective bargaining by many two-year colleges and the resulting inflexibility in institutional budgets produced by fixed personnel costs.

Observation of state legislation reveals a trend toward more state control in line with increasing financial support along with a tight-fisted stance on the part of many states through budgeting, accounting and audit procedures. Therefore, new resources acquisition and use strategies are needed at both the state system and institutional levels.

In other words, community colleges and state system offices must take positive actions by organizing aggressive public relations and recruitment programs and by lobbying at the local, state and federal levels for increased resources to maintain or increase the number of programs and services. We could work together on the federal level but each

institution or system must work within the structure of the local or state governments.

Community college administrators must emphasize to their funding source that the community college is not just an institution, but is a movement serving a mission or function, independent of the high school and the four-year college or university, with different types of curriculum especially suited to the ever-changing civic, social, religious, and vocational needs of the entire local community, dedicated to lifelong learning and providing guidance and counseling and developmental programs not usually found in other levels of higher education. It must also be emphasized that the ability of the community college to meet successfully and serve adequately their multiple goals and functions, requires immediate adaptability which is largely dependent on the extent to which they are funded. To convince these funding sources of the need for an increased share of the tax dollar, administrators must show why their institution or system deserves additional funding. Their arguments or justifications must be predicated on accurate information showing the costs analysis and outcomes of programs and services, and here we have the ideas of "accountability" and "productivity."

Jack Bottenfield has mentioned four basic formulas of state-level support pointed out by Wattenbarger: negotiated budgets for individual institutions; unit rate formulas; minimum foundation funding; and cost-based program funding.

Dr. Walter Garms (1977) in his book, Financing Community Colleges, identified several funding models which he divided into four broad categories: the "free market model;" the "planned economy segment;" the "mixed models" in which there could be four kinds of funding; and the so-called "power equalization formula," which in its purest form takes money

away from the wealthiest districts and equalizes it out among some of the more needy ones.

He also talked about two kinds of composit models with a "modified decentralized model" and a "modified power equalization model."

There are all kinds of models; however, I don't think we can decide here today on one model that would meet the needs of all community colleges or community college systems as they operate within the framework of their respective funding sources. What we can do is discuss these many approaches and take what seems to fit our individual needs.

As we try to develop funding models for state, local and federal aid, we must consider questions such as; from what source? how much? what type? and on what basis (should it be based on FTE, program cost, credit hours, contact hours, or per capita in the service area)? Should there be differential funding based on cost of program, or variation of size and/or location of the college? Should there be differential funding for initiating new programs, or for part-time students, or for part-time instructors? Should there be catagorical funding for special types of programs such as tutoring or testing?

If we try to equalize expenditures, to what level do we try to do so; to the wealthiest district of the service area? to the mean? to the medium? or to what?

What type and how much local, state or federal aid should be provided for continuing adult education (non-credit) programs or for community service programs? What type of funding formula do we need to help encourage efficiency? How do we deal with declining enrollments? How much of the cost of college attendance should the student pay? How do we deal with waiver of tuition for senior citizens, veterans, handicapped, etc.?

I think the people, through their governmental bodies, are currently speaking, and are going to speak out more loudly and more clearly, to answer these questions and express to us the importance of community college services in relation to other local, state and federal services, simply by the amount of money they are willing to expend for these community college services.

I think I hear the public saying that community colleges must provide a high quality education and training primarily designed to permit people to enter job markets or transfer to four-year institutions with high levels of competency. This, of course, would encourage community college attendance.

I think I hear the public saying that community colleges cannot be all things to all people - that people with special wants must bear that expense.

And I think I hear the "open door" closing.

And this brings me to my second area of positive action. Even though community colleges may get a larger share of the "pie," that share may not mean more effective dollars because the total amount available, or the size of the "pie," may be less. Therefore, institutions must also react to the reduction or decrease in effective funds by setting priorities for expenditures and by eliminating expenditures that rank low on the priority list. This requires a complete analysis of the situation and toughness, self-discipline, exactness, and leadership in management.

In prioritizing programs and services we may need to ask such questions as,

- When and for what purpose was this program of service initiated?
- What has been the history of its development?
- What purpose does the program or activity serve now?

- Can the program or service be provided in a less elaborate manner and at a lower cost?

- What reduction of service would result?

- Can the program or service be combined with another activity?

- Can it be reorganized so as to provide greater services at the same cost?

Several strategies for coping with declining effective resources have been expounded. Among the most visible is the one adopted by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in 1973 as official policy. That is, community colleges should become committed to the concept of "community-based, performance-oriented" education.

Gleazer (1974) posed two basic questions regarding this policy. What are the criteria for success? How do we measure output and summarize it for fiscal, legal, and managerial purposes, and if community colleges are to become something different, how receptive is the public going to be?

The third positive action is to take advantage of all federal, state, or private grants available to community colleges.

The contributors to the summer 1978 issue of New Directions for Community Colleges have presented and discussed several strategies by which community colleges throughout the country are coping with reduced resources and I highly recommend its reading.

References

Alfred, R.L. "Editors notes, coping with reduced Resources." New Directions for Community Colleges. Summary 1978 No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, 1978.

Garms, W.I. Financing Community Colleges. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1977.

Glezer, E.J., Jr. "Beyond the Open Door: The Open College." Community and Junior College Journal, 1974, 45 (1), 6-12.

Martorana, S.V., and Morrison, D.G. State Formulas for the Support of Public Two-Year Colleges. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Martorana, S.V. "Shifting Patterns of Financial Support." New Directions for Community Colleges. Summary 1978 No. 22. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, 1978.

Wattenbarger, J.L., and Cage, B.N. More Money for More Opportunity: Financial Support of Community College Systems. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Wattenbarger, J.L., and Starnes, P.M. Financial Support Patterns for Community Colleges, 1976. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Flordia, 1976.

PROPOSALS FOR FINANCING SMALL/RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES--
A BIGGER SHARE OF THE PIE

The small/rural community colleges can make a significant contribution if adequate attention is paid by the state to their special problems. In particular it is important NOT to automatically equate SIZE with QUALITY.

My thesis is that there is a great need for states to identify and appropriately fund the special needs of the small/rural community college.

It must be recognized by the state legislatures that some rural community college districts in the state have an added set of problems that other community college districts do not have. These include factors such as the following: a lower median family income, a higher proportion of families income of $3,000 and less, a higher percentage receiving welfare, a higher percentage of unemployment, less taxable income, less potential for assessed evaluation, often a higher percentage of district land in federally owned forest or other federal land areas which cuts the tax income to the community college district, less people per square mile of district, geographic and cultural isolation, and often less access to needed services.

You, of course, can add other points which specifically characterize your district. But the point is this--many small/rural community colleges have a special added set of problems with which the other institutions do not have to deal.

As pointed out by Martorana, Wattenbarger and Smutz, "The ability of community colleges to meet successfully and to serve adequately their multiple goals and functions has rested at least to some extent on their flexibility and adaptability. They have had to react quickly and effectively to changing economic, social, technical, and occupational conditions.

Their ability to do this is affected by two important considerations, first, the types of programs they can initiate as well as the services they can provide are largely determined by how and to what extent they are funded from public sources, and second, the decisions that can be made and the speed with which they can be effected are significantly affected by the nature of the community college decision-making environment."[1]

The climate is different now than when many community colleges got their bond issues passed to form their districts, to obtain operating funds and particularly to obtain funds for capital construction.

For example, in the 1960's, federal funds in the amount of fifty percent or seventy percent were available to match local funds for capital contrauction.

As you all know, it is extremely difficult now for many local areas to be able to afford bond issues for increased operating expenses and very difficult to get bond issues passed.

Then, Proposition 13 appeared on the western horizon and only time will tell the long-ranging impact which this may have on all of our lives.

As Martorana, et. al., indicate, "How and to what extent community and junior colleges are financed with public funds is undoubtedly one of the most important issues facing these institutions. Certainly financial support is not the only factor that enables an educational operation to be successful, but it is clearly a critical ingredient. Until the late 1950's, local communities provided almost all community and junior college funding. Since that time, however, states have increasingly assumed a major share of the

---

[1]S. V. Martorana, James L. Wattenbarger, and Wayne D. Smutz, Dollars and Directives: Issues and Problems Related to Financial Support and Legal Authorizations of Community Colleges, p. 1, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges/Council of Universities and Colleges/ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

funding responsibility as the number of community and junior colleges rapidly grew throughout the country. This development was inevitable for two reasons. First, local communities could not provide the funds necessary to support comprehensive post-secondary institutions; local property owners, on whom the burden of support fell, simply were not able to increase their tax support for community colleges while also providing for other local services. Second, as states committed themselves to the democratic notion of providing post-secondary education for all citizens, they also more actively involved themselves in community college planning, development, and coordination; along with this increased state-level interest came expanded state-level interest came expanded state-level financial support."[2]

Now we have apparently entered an era in which although most states are still increasing their appropriations to community colleges in terms of dollars appropriated--the average percentage growth rate in appropriations is decreasing. Therefore, we are presented with a financing problem in general which is compounded even further when the specific characteristics and problems of small/rural community colleges are considered.

I would like to pose certain issues for your thinking.

Issue I: There are certain costs which are required for operation of institutions regardless of size and which are unrelated to programs. States should fund 100% of these expenditures: (1) Library--every institution needs a minimum library. (2) Utilities, maintainence and groundskeeping--buildings need seasonal temperature control and must be kept clean, repaired, and in neat order if the investment is to be protected. (3) Meeting recommendations of accrediting and licensing agencies--it appears that there is a

---

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

trend in some states to play down the significant contribution which can be made by following the recommendations of examining teams particularly if implementing these recommendations means spending money. (4) Fringe benefits--this involves the institution's share of the fringe benefits package provided by the institution to its employees. What will be the future ability of the small/rural community college to meet the rising costs of providing these fringes? (5) Costs which the institution must incur because of some state or federal legislation or regulation--facilities for the handicapped, OSHA, Buckley Amendment, Title IX, increasing costs of data gathering and reporting to a multitide of state and federal agencies, changing copyright laws.

Issue II: The need for rethinking concerning the responsibility of states to public institutions compared to private institutions.

No one wants private colleges to go broke!

However, are some states overly concerned with this problem to the exclusion of enough concern about the financial health of the public community colleges?

Do some state systems of student financial aid tend to funnel students into high tuition private colleges?

If the state puts money into public institutions it expects to have a certain amount of control, i.e., over what programs are offered at what institutions, etc. Yet, if the state puts state money into private colleges does it exert the same control there?

Issue III: Proper support by the state to assure adequate access to low tuition community college programs for the people of the state.

The basic "gut" theme of the public community college is to provide educational opportunity regardless of a person's financial standing.

Pragmatically, our alumni pay more taxes as did the WWII GI bill graduates.

Inflation has made it impossible for people to keep up the standard of living which they have so if you raise tuition this hurts the families who at the same time are faced with all of their other costs going up, too.

Education is an investment in society.

Issue IV: Provision by the states so that public community colleges are free to provide adequate offerings in community service activities.

Community colleges should receive state support for activities such as institutes, workshops, short courses and presentations and programs by college personnel of benefit to communities and to specific groups within the communities.

Issue V: Special attention by the state to the added costs of equipping and facilities for occupational programs.

The job are there at good wages. There are people who want to enroll in community college occupational programs. But, the colleges need special help in meeting the added costs above the regular programs to provide quality, up-to-date occupational programs.

Issue VI: State legislative appropriations to public community colleges for acpital purposes.

Public community colleges make a significant contribution to the lives of the people and to the economies of the states.

It is no longer feasible for local property taxpayers and communities to carry the major load in funding capital. In many states, property owners provide for many other local services and also pay to support state universities as well as their own community college.

State universities obtain their capital support and a significant portion

of their operating support from state legislatures.

Issue VII: To what extent should states fund two-year programs in four-year institutions particularly in states where public community college systems and districts exist?

The mission of the public community college is to offer programs of two years (or less) in duration, Yet, we see in some states the proliferation of two-year programs offered by four-year colleges and universities who are state supported.

Is this the wisest investment of state funds?

Issue VIII: Unknown future factors:

In many states we have observed the effects on college budgets of factors such as collective bargaining, tenure, and retrenchment.

Current developments include legislation setting the retirement age at 70.

How will we keep our faculty salaries up with inflation?

What other unknown future factors will impact upon college budgets and what kinds of positive measures can be taken by colleges and by states now in order to provide small/rural community colleges with the necessary reserves in order to successfully meet such unknown future needs?

You have noticed that I believe the burden is getting too heavy to leave entirely with local taxpayers. You have noted that I have not suggested the federal level as a source of great help to us in the future. I have not done so because the signs appear to indicate that small/rural colleges will get even less help from federal programs than they have in the past.

I do not think small/rural community colleges will get much help from the federal government in the future. As an example, I would like to quote

two paragraphs found on page 8 of teh June 16, 1978, issue of Higher Education and National Affairs, "Meanwhile, James T. McIntyre, Jr., director of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, tole a luncheon group in Washington this week, 'It is wishful thinking for local communities to believe that funds cut by taxpayers, such as in California, can be restored by federal money. Such thinking raises false hopes,' he said, 'federal resources are not infinite, indeed these are being stretched tight as things stand today. Looking to Washington for a bailout isn't going to be a viable or sensible solution in the future.'

"McIntyre said his staff is studying the effect of the California vote on federal programs and the federal budget. 'We know, for example, that a number of major federal education programs include a prohibition against using federal funds for activities normally or previously carried out with state or local funds,' he said. He said his staff also is studying similar restrictions in federal child nutrition programs and possible issues and problems that might arise in the public service employment area."

In discussing the topic of capital funds with the staff executive of the Missouri Association of Community and Junior Colleges President's Council, the report of the executive indicated that Dr. Wattenbarger commented that federal funds appear unlikely for capital for community colleges.

Throughout my presentation I have been postulating that for different reasons we cannot in the future expect our local taxpayers to bear the brunt of helping us on operating and capital aid and neither can we expect the federal government to be a great deal of help to us in the future.

I have further postulated that our hope lies with the states. I will now go further to postulate that the states should seriously investigate the state sales tax as a potential source of providing that support to community colleges.

What then are the current funding patterns utilized by the states in providing operating and capital support for public community colleges?

Wattenbarger points out that, "Currently four basic types of state-level support for community colleges are utilized and that each has serious deficiencies: negotiated budgets for individual institutions; unit rate formulas; minimum foundation funding; and cost-based program funding."

Wattenbarger notes, "While the negotiated budget (used by eleven states) provides full state funding it slao permits effective state level control at the same time.

"Twelve states use the unit rate formula (usually based on student credit hours). This approach does permit local control over budget decisions but neither takes into account an institution's responsiveness to the variety of needs at the local level nor has any built-in efficiency incentives. Often, community service programs are not funded either adequately or at all under this approach.

"Eight states use the minimum foundaton funding approach. This approach does provide a minimum funding level for all community colleges while permitting differential district funding according to the value of each district's taxable property. This of course means unequal funding since the level of financial support varies with the wealth of each district."

The fourth approach (that of cost-based program funding) in Wattenbarger's opinion is probably best because it differentiates between programs. However, as Wattenbarger points out, "It does not provide for cost efficiency since lower costs, no matter how attained, will result in less funds."[3]

So, my further postulate is that we need to work with our states and develop approaches which will meet our needs as we go into the future.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 6

Let's take a look at capital funding patterns across the various atates. "However," as Garms indicated in his 1977 Financing Community Colleges, "due to a lack of sufficient data, it is impossible to analyze changing patterns in the funding of capital expenses." Dr. Wattenbarger is currently working on a monograph on capital funding for two-year colleges and I appreciate his sharing his characterization of capital funding patterns with us.

At present there are four basic capital funding models: state financed programs represented by Florida, Connecticut and Massachusetts; locally-financed programs represented by Missouri, Kansas, New Mexico, and South Carolina; state/local cost sharing arrangements represented by Pennsylvania and Illinois; and foundation programs represented by California.

Florida uses a one and one-half cent gross receipts tax on utilities and draws revenue bonds against this as an example of how one state-financed program works.

Missouri requires a two-thirds vote to pass a bond issue on the local district taxpayers to be repaid by local property taxes.

In state/local cost sharing arrangements like Illinois, the state pays seventy-five percent and twenty-five percent from the local district. In Pennsylvania it is fifty-fifty.

In the foundation program (like California) an equalized form of aid is used in which those community college districts below a certain property wealth per pupil are eligible for state assistance, with the poorest districts receiving the largest amounts, Garms reports.

Following California's Proposition 13--other developments are occuring and seem to continue to occur and indeed others may have occured since the time of preparation of this paper in June.

For example, the June 16 issue of the MACJC Newsletter indicates,

(1) the Washington state legislature is pushing for full funding by 1980; (2) in May a New York Court of Appeals prohibited the use of exemptions from the limit on property taxes--thus cutting revenue of fifty school districts by $110 million; (3) the Pennsylvania legislature is considering bills that sould replace local property tax for schools with a surtax on personal income of those living in the school district and moving the state's share of school funding to eighty percent (up from fifty percent).

So, quo vadis? Where are we headed?

If our hope is with the states--where will they get the money to fund us? I suggest that one viable alternative is the state sales tax.

If the states either have or get the money to fund us, how should it be distributed?

Are they ways to get the federal government to give more support?

What kinds of state and federal legislation would help us--perhaps not related directly to appropriations but which would still affect our funding?

Many of the things I have said here today you probably have supported in your own mind as I have gone along. Others, you are against.

Some ideas will work in certain places--others won't.

In the discussion session to follow, my challenge to you is dissect what I have said--put in your own thinking and experience and then in discussion let's work together to develop what you see as possible and practical for us to recommend for implementation.

Whatever we do, let's not wait for others to act upon us first--let's act!

Thank you!

ADDRESS

SMALL RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONFERENCE

VPI & SU

August 5, 1978

By

J. Wade Gilley

Paper presented at National Conference on Small/Rural Colleges (1st, Blacksburg, Virginia, August, 1978)

ADDRESS

SMALL RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONFERENCE

VPI & SU

Twenty-one years ago when I entered Virginia Tech as a freshman in civil engineering, there were 4,700 students enrolled here and only 23,500 enrolled statewide in Virginia's twelve state-supported colleges and universities.

Twenty years later, in the fall of 1977, Virginia had thirty-nine state-supported institutions of higher education including the thirty-four-campus Virginia Community College System, and these public supported institutions enrolled 229,000 students. The budget had increased from $37 million to $859 million in state general funds. Our current biennium budget for colleges and universities is in excess of $1.7 billion.

Truly, this has been remarkable growth and we have seen a golden age of higher Education in the commonwealth of Virginia. Our people and our business and industry have benefited from this growth and development of our higher education system in many ways, including the growth of our economy and the growth in personal income.

However, we are now reaching a point where the public is questioning more and more the vast expenditures in higher education, and many professionals in the field are questioning what will happen when we see a leveling off or drop in enrollment in the mid 1980's.

While I fully understand that we have older citizens going back to college and that the number of college students may not drop, I cannot help but believe that with public education K-12 enrollments dropping at a rate of thirty thousand per year, at least through 1984, when we will have seen a drop from the high of 1.1 million public school students to a low of 930,000, that this cannot help but impact on the number of high school seniors who go on to college and thus the number of full-time students who enter our colleges, which will dramatically impact on our F.T.E. enrollments which dictates our budgets.

The senior survey of the Virginia State Department of Education in 1977 showed that 57+% of our 1977 high school graduates had planned to go onto a post-secondary institution. Thus, it is difficult to project a dramatic increase in the college-going rate of high school seniors, which will offset the sure-to-come decline in the number of seniors.

Because of the growth in the vast sums of public money committed to higher education, we have seen an ever-increase in the level of state control. In 1957 when I was a freshman here at Virginia Tech, the State Council of Higher Education only had two employees--the director and a secretary--and their job was primarily to promote a vigorous system of higher education. Today, our State Council of Higher Education finds itself with far more

powers and a staff of more than sixty professionals and support personnel who have a variety of legislative mandated duties in the coordination of our total system of higher Education. The State Council has the responsibility for:

1. Approval of college missions
2. Approval of new degree programs
3. Coordination of continuing education programs
4. Establishment, in cooperation with the state budget office, of budget guidelines
5. Analyzing and recommending of budgets for higher education to the executive and legislative branches of our government
6. A wide variety of administrative chores, such as administering state scholarships, affirmative action programs, etc.

While the State Council coordinates our community college system and has the same authority over community colleges as it does over senior institutions, we have in Virginia a State Department of Community Colleges, which has broad control authority (under the supervision of a lay-citizen state board for community colleges) over our large community college system, which now enrolls over 100,000 students.

The question is not whether we will have more state coordination and control,

But, how much and how fast?

How will we, as college administrators, respond to this new coordination and control?

And how will it work?

Will it work for the good of all the citizens and the colleges themselves?

Vaughan Huckfeldt in 1972 in an article,
"Forecast of Changes in Post-secondary Education"
found in response from 385 leaders (including federal congressmen, state governors and legislators and their critical staff members, members of state coordinating boards, officials of national education associations, students, faculty and college and un iversity administrators) to one of the key change statements in the study

"Operations and administrators in post-secondary education will become consolidated and centrally controlled."

Eighty-one percent of the respondents felt that this change was virtually certain to occur and the comparable percentage thought it would occur by 1978-79.

Without question, it has occurred.

Wattenbarger and Case in a manuscript on community college finance indicated that:
"A state cannot expect to have a complete state system of junior (community) college level education without making provisions for a coordinating agency."

The question, therefore, in this conference and for small rural colleges is what are the positive and negative impacts of state coordination?

First, I would like to go over some of the positive points of state coordination and control for small rural colleges:

1. Certainly there is a direct correlation between the level of state coordination and equitable state funding for all institutions. Small rural colleges do not have the alumni and political clout that a large university has, and therefore, almost invariably, the more state coordination and control that exist within a state, the better the funding situation is for the small rural college.

2. In a state controlled or coordinated system, enrollment is controlled to a certain degree on uniform basis which assists small colleges during times of enrollment drops. That is, if a small rural community college is a part of a larger state system, including universities, which is controlled by a coordinating board such as the Virginia State Council of Higher Education, enrollment constraints on the popular universities, in our case--VPI, U.Va., Madison and William & Mary--will certainly assist small rural colleges in avoiding enrollment declines in the years ahead.

3. State coordination and control of programs allow small and rural colleges to develop a unique program without the fear of numerous other institutions around the state grabbing their unique programs and forcing them out of business. Examples here in Virginia include the forestry program at Dabney Lancaster Community College, etc.

4. Because of uniform formulas for financing all colleges, tuition at small rural colleges is kept in line--there is no temptation or authority to raise fees just to increase the budget. Therefore, while the tuition can remain modest, the college does have state support to offer a high quality program.

5. Small rural colleges are established quicker under a statewide control system. There is no question in my mind that had we not had the State Board for Community Colleges and the State Department of Community Colleges in Virginia, many of our small rural colleges would not have been established today, and our community college system would not be completed.

So, in summary, the advantages of statewide coordination and control to small rural colleges is better and more equitable financing, a certain degree of protection of enrollments, a certain degree of protection of the unique

programs, tuition policies which are in keeping with the mission of the institution, a degree of uniform quality that is not present without state control and coordination, and finally, the very existence of many small rural community colleges is dependent upon a statewide system of coordination and control.

Now looking toward the negative points of statewide coordination and control, I have listed a few here:

1. Frequently, the budget formulas do not take into account such items as critical mass of faculty and staff and economies of scale. Usually the same formula for staffing is applied to a college of five hundred F.T.E. and to a college twenty thousand F.T.E. This creates numerous problesm for the small rural college.

2. State coordination requires more responsiveness on the part of all colleges to the state bureaucracy in such things as forms. For example, we have seen an increase from zero to $56 million in data processing expenditures in the commonwealth during the past twenty years. Much of this is due to the requirements of the state and federal government. The burden on small colleges is proportionately much greater than it is on large colleges.

3. State coordination governs to some extent the college organizations and limits the number of administrators in relation to the number of students. As a result of the state coordination in matching up between state offices and local colleges the requirements of state coordination and the requirements of the local campus programs, many persons in small rural colleges wear many hats, frequently feeling frustrated and unable to do a good job in either area. Small colleges are further handicapped by being unable to hire specialists in one area or the other because of varied duties required imposed on a small administrative staff.

4. State coordinating agencies require more accountability and must be in a position to respond to legislative and executive requirements, either at the state or the federal level. This creates the need to publicize data, and in many cases, small colleges appear to be inefficient when campared to larger institutions. This data which is frequently published and disseminated widely not only embarrasses the small rural college, but creates difficulty for it, both in its home community and in statewide funding.

5. A major problem with which we are all concerned in every state is that the coordinating or controlling

board staff are usually located in the state capitol, which is usually an urban area. As a result, these persons have difficulty in identifying with the problems and potential of small rural colleges and do not spend sufficient time incorporating the needs and aspirations of small rural colleges into the state plan.

In summary, we see that there are negative aspects to state coordination and state control, but I believe that the fear, the inordinate fear, of rural college administrators is not necessarily justified because the question of quality, equitable funding, program and enrollment protection, and even the existence of small rural colleges is dependent upon statewide coordination and a statewide plan for higher education. Thus, it is my opinion that the existence and functioning of these institutions in the main is tremendously enhanced by statewide control and coordination.

Thank you.

STATE COORDINATION AND CONTROL - GOOD NEWS OR BAD NEWS FOR THE SMALL RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By

Gerald B. James

and

Elton Collier Aycock

Rockingham Community College
Wentworth, North Carolina

Paper presented at National Conference on Small/Rural Colleges (1st, Blacksburg, Virginia, August, 1978)

STATE COORDINATION AND CONTROL - GOOD NEWS OR BAD NEWS FOR THE SMALL RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE*

The argument for state coordination and control of small rural community colleges may appear, in theory, to be acceptable. After all, if community colleges are increasingly to be funded by the state, then increasingly they may expect to come under state public and political scrutiny, especially during an era of tight money when education is viewed perhaps less favorably than it was ten years ago, and at the same time when there are increasing demands to meet needs in urban society, the environment, health care, and other social programs. (16)

So what is the answer to this new demand for accountability and austerity regarding the small rural community college? Is it state coordination and control? The theory runs that consideration of a whole system permits a "more objective determination of priorities," that coordination of personnel and task objectives leads to avoidance of duplication and therefore more efficiency, resulting in what, supposedly makes state coordination and control desirable - reduced costs. (16)

Does state coordination assure objective program planning?

Rather than assuring objective program planning, state coordination more often assures insensitivity to local educational needs - needs of local people, identified by local advisory committees and developed into appropriate courses and programs by local personnel who know the people and keep in constant touch with them.

Does state coordination assure reduced costs and greater efficiency?

Robert H. McCabe has made the point that "most centralization increases indirect costs, administrative costs, and management costs, thus diverting funds from programs and invariably adding to the costs of operations, while at the same time seriously impeding program development and adding to the growing dissatisfaction of those working in higher education." (16)

The alternative to a high degree of state coordination and state control is local autonomy: educational decision-making at the grass roots level; educational deicsions of the people, by the people, and for the people - the local people - who are directly affected. The community college is strictly an American invention. It grew out of our great democracy and is now indeed one of democracy's great pillars. Local autonomy is democratic; state control is autocratic.

Community colleges must relate to the communities where they are rooted and not simply to state-mandated regimentation. They must open their doors even wider, welcome even more part-time students, more minorities, more underprivileged, more handicapped, and more old people. With such a diverse student population, community colleges are going to have to experiment, be innovative, develop new programs, and, in effect, be even more locally oriented than at present.

Change Magazine estimates that for every administrator added on the state level to oversee post-secondary education, up to three additional persons must be added to the administrative staffs of the larger colleges. (2, p. 18-19). Rural community colleges are not generally large colleges, but this may give a good indication of direction.

Another factor one might consider, as the state demands more and more input into the decision-making process of the community college, is the paperwork involved.

(1) What is the cost to an institution to prepare and submit reports and forms? Who pays?

(2) How often does an institution have to submit information to one agency and then only a week later, have to submit the same information to a different branch on a slightly different form?

(3) Do time demands and deadlines for these reports and forms preempt actions on matters more directly relevant to the operation of the community college?

(4) Who knows where and to whom each report and form should go? It is said that, now, a college needs a full-time attorney just to know to whom to send what and how to interpret what comes back. (2, p. 20-21).

At one community college, staff members fill out in excess of seventy-five forms annually at a cost of more than $100,000. (2, p. 22)

So who suffers when a state doles out a given amount of money and more and more of that given amount must be used to keep up with the administrative burdens brought about by state control? Primarily the students will suffer through lower faculty-to-student ratios and fewer program offerings. The colleges will not escape either, because, as they begin to lose their intimacy with their students, a prime source of their strength will begin to erode.

It becomes obvious, then, that state coordination and control may not only be more expensive, but that it has the possible added side effect of leading to program deterioration. (2, p. 22)

The original idea of the community college as a small institution characterized by a close relationship with its surrounding community may not be applicable to systems such as the Chicago community college system with eight branches or the Los Angeles system with seven branches. The small rural community college, however, traditionally has had a flavor of its own. As stated by John W. Casey: Every community college is different; there are no twins; there are only family resemblances. Each is a distinct entity, having been sired by the setting that surrounds it. (8, p. 2) Communities differ; community colleges differ and cannot all be operated the same.

It is clear, then, "that statewide masterplanning and control do not best serve the educational interests of the state and the educational needs at the community level." (14, p. 62) As states seek to gain more and more control over local institutions, will local colleges have the integrity, in the face of this challenge, to continue along the path that has brought them so far and wrought so much good across this land; or do they content themselves with complacency, resigned to take their state-assigned place and follow the leader in an area where local autonomy has not only led the nation, but led the world? The press for standardization and uniformity in the guise of coordination continues to creep across the land, questioning the very foundations on which the community college system reached such unprecedented heights.

Those who propose state coordination and control to insure streamlining and efficiency will argue that local responsiveness to community needs will not be seriously affected, quickly adding, however, that due to their fiscal responsibility to the public,

cost-benefit analysis must first be weighed. Then, if a new program of instruction is proposed to fill a need in a community, it may authorized six months from now, or maybe next year, when and if the appropriate board decides it's even worthwhile at all.

For a community college to fulfill its basic role of meeting the needs of its community, it is imperative that the community have the primary and major input into priorities and policies relating to local services and programming. (1, p. 52) A Special Report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: The Open Door Colleges, states that, "Persons who are thoroughly familiar with their local communities are likely to be far better qualified to make wise decisions about the location and development of community colleges than state officials who are involved in statewide planning." (7, p. 47) Furthermore, the report states, occupational programs need to be geared to local employment opportunities; and, for that reason, it is particularly desirable that they be guided by advisory committees comprised of persons thoroughly familiar with local labor markets. (7, p. 47) One would think that, at the very minimum, the states would have seen fit to trust the local institutions in determining curriculum. For if the community colleges had failed to meet community needs in this pivotal area in their short history, would they have grown so fast? As Arthur Cohen has pointed out, state bureaucrats can easily become absentee curriculum makers. (9, p. 53)

It can be documented also that reasonable independence improves the spirit of the campus, the sense of responsibility of faculty members, studens, administrators, and trustees. Only with a sense

of local responsibility and of devotion among these central groups to their own institution, can a campus be fully effective. (4, p. 23)

In contrast to this, when a state begins to run the college, trustees and administrators forget how to be educational leaders. Instead of trying to determine what programs of instruction will best serve the needs of the people, they are busy trying to figure out how to manipulate funding formulas. Deans of instruction who used to spend time considering the merits of particular courses might spend their time trying to determine which state agency has the final say on whether a program may be offered at all and what data must be supplied to justify it. (9, p. 53)

As we look to the future, we find reason for concern over increasing state control. Alban E. Reid's warning seems appropriate:

> As we tend to abandon our commitment to serving the community needs, it becomes easier to accept the computer directed leadership of state boards and coordinating councils. Insittutional integrity becomes lost in a morass of statewide planning which is not really planning for the facilitation of response to community needs but planning to satisfy those who govern. Coordination is replaced by domination. Soon the institutes which held the promise of release for the many becomes an institute which lacks the ability to sustain its own sense of direction, let alone provide a sense of direction for those to whom it represented the only hope in an increasingly stultifying society. (18, p. 12)

Furthermore, the Carnegie Commission warns: "There are about a dozen states in which the state government has assumed complete control of the community college system and there seems to be a trend in this direction. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education believes this trend should be reversed." (7, p. 48)

In summary, there is room for and need for some coordination and cooperative effort among institutions. This need can and must

be met without succumbing to a high degree of state control, thereby yielding in principle and in effectiveness. Community colleges are community oriented institutions. The primary goal is to identify and meet the educational needs of the local people. Local people are best qualified to perform these functions.

---

*By Gerald B. James and Elton Collier Aycock, Rockingham Community College, Wentworth, North Carolina

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bender, Louise W., The States, Communities and Control of the Community College: Issues and Recommendations. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C. 1975. 63pp.

2. Bender, Louise W. and Breuder, Robert L., "The Federal State Paperwork Menace," Community College Review, Vol. 5, No. 1. 1977. pp. 16-23.

3. Campbell, Ronald, "Local Control, Myth or Reality," Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 48, No. 8. May, 1978. pp. 48-50.

4. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. 1973. 249 pp.

5. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Priorities for Action, Final Report of the Carnegie Commission. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. 1973.

6. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Capitol and the Campus: State Responsibility for Post-secondary Education. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. 1971. 154 pp.

7. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York. 1970.

8. Casey, John W., The Role and Scope of the Community College - New Directions. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Insittute of Education, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. September, 1976. 10 pp.

9. Cohen, Arthur M., "Community Colleges: The Growing Influence of the State," Change, Vol. 6, No. 5. June, 1974. pp. 52-53.

10. Davidson, Arnold C., "Are State Bureaucrats Running our Colleges," Community College Review, Vol. 4, No. 3. Winter, 1977.

11. Halstead, D. Kent, Statewide Planning in Higher Education. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1974.

12. Harbacker, Ervin L., What it means to be Community Based. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education, U. S. Government Printing Office. November, 1974. 9 pp.

13. Holladay, Sylvia A., Control of Our Own Curriculum in the Community College. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1976. 14 pp.

14. Johnston, J. Richard, "Funding and Control: Critical Choices for Community Colleges", Community College Review, Vol. 5, No. 2. 1977. pp. 59-64.

15. King, Maxwell C. and Breuder, Robert L., Contemporary Issues in Post-secondary Education: With Emphasis on the Community Junior College. Brevard Community College, Cocoa, Fla. July, 1976. 117 pp.

16. McCabe, Robert H., "Planning for a Community College Ssytem," Planning for Higher Education, Vol. 6, No. 3. December, 1977.

17. Paradise, Michael E., "Reversing the Trend: Back to Local Control," Community and Junior College Review , Vol. 47, No. 4. December-January, 1976-1977. pp. 18-20.

18. Reid, Alban E., Some Thoughts of the State of Community College Education at the Start of its Fourth Quarter Century. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. May, 1977. 14 pp.

19. Stalap, Robert; Lester, Patricia; and Wilson, Jerry, "Local Control of Community Colleges: Myth or Reality," Community College Forntiers, Vol. 6, No. 2. Winter, 1978. pp. 33-36.

20. Thornton, James W., Jr., The Community Junior College. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York. 1960.

21. Wattenbarger, James L.; Bender, Louise W., "Challenge Ahead: State Level Control," Junior College Journal, Vol. 42, No. 9. June-July, 1972. pp. 17-20.

22. Zoglin, Mary Lou, Power and Politics in the Community College. ETC Publications, Palm Springs, California. 1976.

Remarks Made by Richard E. Wilson at the National Conference of Small/ Rural Community Colleges in Blacksburg, Virginia on August 4, 1978.

In recent years the development and continuing growth of two-year colleges have altered the traditional pattern of higher education. These institutions have made post-secondary education accessible to many more Americans, and have added new dimensions to the concept of continued learning. The reasons for this trend include the two-year college's relatively low-cost tuition, locations that are easily reached, and a diversity of course offerings. A brief look at some recent data will highlight the growing popularity of these institutions.

The AACJC directory includes 1,235 institutions. The instrument used to collect information for the directory asked each responding college to check either urban, suburban, or rural. 551 colleges checked rural. Although a few colleges may have mistakenly checked this category, it is safe to conclude that at least 500 community colleges perceive themselves to be rural institutions. Furthermore, an examination of the enrollment figures shows that 628 institutions listed in the directory enrolled less than 2,000 students in the fall of 1977.

1. You should also be aware of the magnitude of the community college effort across the country. The 1,235 institutions enroll 4,309,984 students for credit. In addition at least three million more people are enrolled for non-credit. Therefore, in 1977, community, junior and technical colleges were serving at least

seven and a half million people across the country.

2. There are several other facts about the 1977 enrollment in community colleges that will interest you. 36 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment in all of post-secondary education was in community colleges. 53 percent of all students enrolled in college for the first time attended community colleges.

3. Sixty percent of the community college students attend part-time.

4. 51 percent of all community college students are women and 52 percent of part-time students are women. (Women accounted for 93 percent of the enrollment increase in the fall of 1977.)

5. Minority students account for between 15 and 20 percent of the full-time enrollment.

6. The ages of community college students are older than the stereotype undergraduates. Two thirds of the students attending community colleges are over the age of 21. Several colleges report an average age of 30 or older.

7. Community college students come from families with relatively low incomes, e.g. 37 percent were from families with annual incomes of less than $13,000.

8. 30 percent of the community college students are married and living with their spouses, which is twice the proportion of four year college students.

9. 80 percent of the first time community college students state that a principal reason for attending is to obtain a better job. One fourth of the students selected community colleges because of the low tuition rates.

10. Two thirds of the community college students are employed while attending college, whereas forty percent of the four year college students are employed while attending college.

11. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, enrollments in community colleges will increase 48 percent between 1975 and 1985 whereas enrollments in four year colleges will increase only four percent during the same period.

In general, it can be stated that community college students are older, have more responsibilities, such as being married and holding jobs while attending college, are enrolled in college to obtain skills and knowledge to obtain a better job, and are enrolled part-time. It can also be stated that community college students are becoming more and more representative of the total population of the country.

Part of the preparation for this conference was a quick survey of rural community colleges to identify difficulties or challenges that are of special concern to small/rural colleges. (A copy of the survey form is enclosed.) The survey instrument was sent to the 551 colleges that indiciated they are rural. 111 useful returns were received.

The results of part one are included on the enclosed form. The first column is a rank order of the problem areas, i.e. number one (1) being the most critical and number twelve (12) the least. The second column contains the number of colleges that rated that item to be one of the five most critical problems. Responses of six and lower were not tabulated.

An examination of the responses to part one suggests that the most important problem areas are those areas where the colleges have the least amount of control or independence. For example, the two highest rated problems were communicating the needs of the colleges to local and state decision makers and implementing a long range planning process to anticipate changes in enrollment and programs. Both of these problem areas are greatly dependent on actions taken by state and local officials outside of the college, and in many cases outside of education. Effective communication of needs of the college to local and state decision makers will result in the college receiving the needed support

from those agencies. Ineffective communication will result in the college being denied needed resources. The implementation of a long range plan depends on knowing what resources are going to be available. Since decisions regarding those resources are often times made by local and state decision makers, the college administrators can feel as if they have little or no control over their own destiny.

Problem areas of least concern were placing students in jobs appropriate to their educational skills and backgrounds, involving other community agencies and groups in cooperative programs, and staffing education programs, ~~and staffing education programs,~~ credit and non-credit, in the colleges. Those are areas where each college has considerable influence. In other words, one can conclude from the responses that administrators of small/rural colleges are most frustrated by problem areas where they have the least amount of control with the most dependence on people outside the college, and least frustrated in areas where they have considerable control and independence.

Responses to part B of the survey are summarized as follows:

Part II, Solutions and Resolutions

(Some of the written responses received to this section)

1. Community Cultural and Educational Opportunities:

   Sponsor American Issues Forum

   Visiting Artist Program - Artist in Residence

   Arts Council - Little Theatre Groups - Dinner Theatre - Folk Arts Festival

   Joint sponsorship of cultural events with local arts councils

   Arrange art, theatre tours/trips

   Mail comprehensive info bulletin to all residents every quarter

   Workshops for special groups

   Establish cultural institute to focus on indigenous cultural activities

   Use volunteers to assess needs and establish programs

   Obtain CETA worker to plan and conduct cultural activities

2. Vocational Training Programs:

   Redesign vocational programs to apply certificate program courses toward associate degrees

   Started new vocational programs in indigenous natural resources, e. g. forestry and recreation

   Meetings and written communication with high school personnel, students and parents

   New programs in human services for rural area, e.g. social work, public administration and recreation

   Cooperative use of high school and industry facilities - offer cooperative education option to make available better facilities and more competent faculty assistance

   Obtain apprenticeship training grants from DOL (Mohegan Community College, Connecticut)

3. Cooperation With Community Agencies and Groups:

Establish working committees

Provides space (office & exercise trail) for park and recreation commission

Provide office space for state wide study committees

Cooperate with three other agencies to finance community services

Job descriptions specify community affairs assignments

Established local committee of organizations offering non-credit programs

Use VISTA volunteers to supplement cooperative efforts

4. External Funding:

Establish a foundation to raise funds for buildings, scholarships, and special activities

Develop a consortium with other local colleges to raise money

Establish a development office that works closely with Alumni affairs program

Offer CETA program

Obtain membership on local and state planning and advisory committees

Involve entire staff in external funding

Seek funding sources especially interested in small colleges and the particular population served by a college

5. Research/Data Requirements and Long-Range Planning:

Obtain support and assistance of local leaders

Obtain CETA Title VI needs assessment grant

Have Saturday morning meetings of administrators for planning

Created a full-time staff position to direct function

11. Job Placement:

Offer special courses to develop personal plans, prepare resumes and prepare for interviews

Obtain external CETA funding and cooperate with state employment office

Give certain faculty members, e.g. occupational instructors released time to facilitate job placement

12. Innovative Programming:

Establish off campus centers

Establish consortium to use cable television

Adjust college calendar to accomodate local economy, e.g. job schedules of potential students

Provide cassette tapes - audio and TV

Correspondence courses

Offer individualized, self-instruction courses

REW:chc
8/10/78

A. Below is a list of difficulties or challenges commonly confronting community, junior and technical colleges, but of special concern to those at small/rural colleges. Rank the following problem areas in order from most (rank #1) to least (#12) critical for your institution.

AACJC #of Responses of 1 through 5

(10) 35 Staffing educational programs, credit and/or noncredit, with qualified faculty.

(7) 49 Reaching specific target populations (e.g. women, minorities, low-income) in your community.

(6) 50 Competing successfully for external funding, such as CETA, and Title III.

(8) 43 Gathering and reporting community data vital for planning and research.

(1) 62 Communicating the needs of the college to local/state decision makers.

(12) 28 Placing students in jobs appropriate to their educational skills and backgrounds.

(11) 32 Involving other community agencies and groups in cooperative programs. (e.g. K-12 schools, labor unions, county agencies)

(9) 42 Becoming involved in innovative instructional and outreach techniques such as credit for experience, individualized learning centers, basic skills centers.

(4) 51 Expanding facilities to accomodate present needs.

(2) 57 Implementing a long-range planning process to anticipate changes in enrollment and programs.

(3) 51 Initiating new educational credit programs in vocational or academic areas.

(5) 50 Broadening the cultural and educational opportunities of the community through new community service programs.

____ Other (please specify): _____

_____

(Please complete questions on other side)

NAME OF COLLEGE: _____

ADDRESS: _____

_____

Please return to: Vice President for Programs
AACJC
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 410
Washington, D. C. 20036

CURRICULUM COMPREHENSIVENESS ON LIMITED RESOURCES: A PHILOSOPHICAL OVERVIEW WITH PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

By

George B. Vaughan

Among the many problems indigenous to rural America, and which must thus ultimately be faced by the rural community college, are outmigration of the young, isolationism, the loss of political influence resulting from the one-man-one-vote rule, a lack of diversified cultural activities, inadequate medical care, poor roads, little or no public transportation, inadequate social services, a lack of adequate recreational facilities, a lack of trained leadership willing to work together, and finally, the economic frustrations which often result from limited job opportunities and a lack of upward mobility within existing jobs.

Can the comprehensive community college live up to its inherent promise of being one of the truly great hopes for helping to solve the problems of rural America? Or will it simply add to the frustrations of a population that has often learned to live with its "rising expectations?"

One can safely say that the community college brings with it many promises to rural America: it promises the businessman it will train workers for often nonexistent jobs; it promises society in general that it will serve as a catalyst for bringing new industry

into the area; it promises to identify the needs of the population and indeed to respond to those needs; it promises to make learning fun for young and old alike; in summary, to rural America, the community college promises hope--hope built on a philosophy of meeting a wide range of needs for the total population it serves.

The Need For Comprehensiveness

Historically, leaders in the community college field have rightly emphasized the word community when referring to their institutions. While definitions are often tender traps, I maintain that the word community when used to describe the type of educational institution we are talking about has little meaning unless used in conjunction with the word comprehensive. Therefore, when one discusses most community colleges without alluding to the comprehensive community college, the definition is, in my opinion, incomplete. By adding the term comprehensive, one can readily see that a major problem arises for most rural community colleges--how to provide curriculum comprehensiveness. The following examines some strategies for getting more out of limited resources. Some of the philosophical questions related to "being comprehensive" will be examined, and some practical solutions will be suggested for moving from the philosophical to the practical.

Providing curriculum comprehensiveness in the rural community college has been cited by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' (AACJC) Task Force of the Small/Rural

Community College as a key to equal educational opportunity for rural areas. The Task Force states that "it is in the public interest that rural community colleges maintain complete and comprehensive curricula and programs of service." The Task Force calls upon the Board of Directors of the AACJC to support the idea of comprehensiveness in rural community colleges through contacting governmental agencies, establishing legislative liaison to help shape bills pertaining to rural America, through publishing articles and brochures dealing with the subject, and through the publication of a monograph dealing with rural problems.[1] While the Task Force has been helpful in calling national attention to the plight of the rural community college (see Harry S. Margolis, "Rural Academe," Change, June/July, 1978, pp. 62-63), curricula comprehensiveness remains for the most part the concern of the individual college. With this in mind, the following looks at three areas of concern most rural community colleges face as they attempt to remain comprehensive in their offerings. These areas deal with the role of the faculty, cooperation among institutions, and transportation.

---

[1]Position Papers, Task Force of the Small/Rural Community College, (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, October 25-27, 1976), pp. 2-3.

Utilizing Faculty

If a rural community college is to offer a comprehensive program, it must have faculty members who are able and willing to produce comprehensive offerings in curricula, courses, and community services. Implicit in the concept of comprehensiveness is the belief that an institution will allocate its resources in such a manner as to provide a wide variety of services. These services--whether in the form of credit courses or community activities--must provide the vital link between the college and the community. If the link is to be established, the faculty must understand the community and its problems; it must understand the mission of the rural college; it must be willing to utilize community resources; and it must develop activities designed to meet community needs within the established guidelines and resources of the college. If the faculty generally accepts the concept of offering a comprehensive program, it then must seek some practical ways to assure that its commitment goes beyond philosophy.

Some of the more obvious ways in which a faculty may work toward providing comprehensiveness in the college's offerings are through the use of advisory committees, teaching in more than one discipline, working on community projects, or any number of things one normally associates with the comprehensive community college, regardless of its location. But there are more subtle means of working toward comprehensiveness.

Rural community colleges, like other community colleges, are tied to a formula which directly relates funding to full-time students. Since this is the case, there is often a temptation to schedule classes only during those times of the day when classes will be at their largest, thus guaranteeing that all faculty members generate a maximum number of full-time students--hopefully enough for the college to break even. However, if this line of reasoning is constantly pursued, the college will not be able to provide a comprehensive curriculum for its service area since not all people will be able to take courses during "peak times." A solution requires a commitment on both the part of the faculty and the college administration.

First, faculty members must be willing to teach at times other than daytime hours. It goes without saying that most community colleges "require" faculty members to teach in both "the day and evening." However, one wonders how many full-time faculty members actually teach regularly in the evening. (The subject of full-time faculty teaching in the evening program would make an interesting study.) In the rural community college, with its dearth of qualified part-time faculty members, it is imperative that regular faculty members teach in the evening program if the college is to have a comprehensive program with qualified instructors. I am suggesting that all full-time faculty members be assigned to teach at least one course per semester (credit or non-credit) in the

evening program. Moreover, I am suggesting that evening course needs be identified by the person in charge of the evening program, who, in turn, can expect to have these needs met to a great extent by the regular teaching faculty.[2]

The administration must recognize that, if the college is to offer a comprehensive program, some faculty members will not generate the number of full-time students for which they are funded. This fact must be accepted and other solutions found to build larger classes during popular hours, to seek out qualified bankers, lawyers, and others who will teach courses for little pay, and to explore local, foundation, and federal sources for income to supplement the regular funding source.

Utilization Resources Through Cooperation

The second area of concern I will address is in regard to utilizing resources through cooperation between colleges. For example, many rural areas have a need for registered nurses. Yet often the rural community college cannot afford to finance a nursing program. Furthermore, many rural areas cannot provide the total clinical facilities needed for a successful nursing program. Yet if two or more community colleges combine their resources and if the communities served by the colleges are to share clinical facilities, it is possible to offer a nursing program

---

[2]For a further discussion of assigning regular faculty members to teach in community services and continuing education programs see George B. Vaughan, "A President's Formula: Involving the Entire Faculty in Community Services," Community College Review, March, 1975. pp. 48-52.

without sending the college into bankruptcy. This approach to nursing is being successfully carried out by Mountain Empire, Southwest Virginia, and Virginia Highlands Community College here in Virginia. There are certainly other examples of programs of this type, but the Virginia program serves to demonstrate that rural community colleges can expand their comprehensiveness while utilizing their limited resources wisely.

Similarly, rural community colleges can join together to try new programs while sharing costs. If community colleges in adjoining areas identify the need for a program, but cannot justify expending the total resources needed for that program, it might prove feasible to offer a joint program. While the chances of success are not guaranteed through the joining of forces, they are increased through greater enrollments and shared costs. Moreover, the risk involved is shared as well as expenses.

Another approach to sharing resources and meeting the needs of a comprehensive community college is in the area of program mobility. This approach is especially appropriate in state systems where, in reality, equipment belongs to the state, and faculty members are employed by the state. An example of this approach would be for several community colleges jointly to identify a need for a program whose graduates would flood the market of any one college service area over a period of years. Once the need is identified, one college would agree to employ the faculty members

needed to conduct the program with the understanding that they would "rotate" among an established group of other colleges in the future. For example, many rural areas need plumbers. However, generally one or two graduating classes can handle the plumbing needs of a rural area for a number of years. Once the need is met, the equipment and faculty would be transferred to another college and then perhaps another. Ideally, if the original area again identifies the need for additional plumbers, the program would return to that college. Meanwhile, the colleges have utilized their resources in a way that is both economical and comprehensive.

Transportation: Our Achilles' Heel

The third point I wish to cover concerns transportation.[3] Perhaps it is in this area that the greatest challenge ever faced by the comprehensive community college is in the making: the energy situation as exemplified in the community college student's reliance on some form of transportation. In my opinion, we are so vulnerable in the area of transportation that I refer to it as our Achilles' Heel. The fact that rural community colleges are often faced with poor roads, long distances for students to travel, and a lack of large population centers places them even more at the mercy of some form of transportation which, in most cases, is the automobile. Assuming that rural community colleges presently rely on transportation for survival (and the Winter of '74 left little doubt that this is

---

[3]Much of the following discussion regarding transportation is taken from George B. Vaughan, "Transportation: The Community College's Achilles' Heel," Community College Review, Summer, 1978, forthcoming.

the case), what, if anything can they do to insure that they remain comprehensive as our once unlimited supply of thirty cents a gallon gasoline creeps toward a limited supply selling for a dollar a gallon or more?

First, rural community colleges can continue to decentralize their course offerings. But here the problem becomes more difficult than at urban campuses, for if the rural college is to remain comprehensive and if it is to use its resources wisely, it can only decentralize certain aspects of its operations. (I am amused by those educators who advocate doing away with the college campus in rural areas, for this approach would largely eliminate the community college's reason to exist--namely, to provide facilities and services not provided by other aspects of the community.) In almost all rural areas, for example, it is impossible to find suitable locations other than the college campus for teaching electronics technology, computer science, drafting and design, and any number of highly technical curricula requiring expensive, up-to-date equipment and teaching space for a relatively large number of students. However, what is available in community locations is the space needed to teach most general education courses and other less "equipment-oriented" courses which cut across a number of curricula.

In addition to decentralized offerings through off-campus locations, the possibilities for off-campus instruction via closed circuit and public television, newspapers, radio, and other media

are unlimited. However, the thesis presented here is that it will be impossible within existing resources to equip off-campus operations in sparsely settled areas in such a manner as to eliminate the need for a main campus. It appears, then, that the future of the rural community college, if it is to be comprehensive, lies in the combination of a campus-based and community-based[4] institution of learning. The link to this approach is transportation.

If the rural community college campus is to remain a viable center of learning, transportation must be available. Presently federal and state governments are exploring the possibility of mass-transit systems in rural areas. Indeed, some local officials in Virginia are viewing mass-transit in the same light as health services, police and fire protection, and other public services. If mass-transit services develop for rural areas, community college leaders must do all within their power to be included in the system and to assure that their colleges are given the same priority as health care, shopping areas, and other services people require. To be viewed as a major "bus stop" in the mass-transit network in rural areas will require that local, state, and national political leaders be aware of the community college's dependence on transportation. For rural community colleges to ignore the potential of mass-transit in the educational process

---

[4]Community-based education, as used in this discussion, refers to using off-campus locations for teaching classes and does not refer to the broader concept of community-based education which is advocated by many community college leaders today.

is to ignore the inherent threat imposed by the community college's reliance on transportation.

As rural community colleges seek new and better ways to utilize transportation, they should seek ways to use student travel time for instructional purposes. A look into the future leaves little doubt that college students will devote more and more time to viewing, to listening, and in essence, to learning from a various number of devices. The rural community college, with its long travel time, and its fight to remain comprehensive while at the same time husbanding its scarce resources, should look closely at learning in transit. Both private automobiles and mass-transit vehicles of the future can readily be equipped with cassette players, recorders, and other equipment that not only make learning in transit feasible, but also desirable. For those students who must travel either to an off-campus center or to the campus, learning in transit can provide a means of using valuable time. If transportation is indeed the community college's Achilles' Heel, the rural college can take the lead in demonstrating to the nation that increasingly scarce resources can be used wisely and that the curriculum can remain comprehensive.

A Final Word

In the foregoing I have centered my thoughts around the utilization of faculty, facilities, and equipment--both instruction and transportation--to suggest ways of maintaining curriculum

comprehensiveness on limited resources. I have chosen to concentrate in three areas rather than provide you with a long list of things which can and are being done in rural community colleges. If the word comprehensive in our title is to have meaning, we must start now to plan ways in which we can retain and develop comprehensiveness in our colleges. Our philosophy provides the framework within which we are to work. Our mission demands that we be comprehensive. Our limited resources mean that we must be inventive. Fortunately, our main limitations are in our own imagination and in our lack of willingness to take chances. At this time in our history the rural community college must not ignore its philosophy, its mission, or its resources, nor must it retreat into conservativism. Instead, the time is right for rural community colleges to set the pace in providing a comprehensive curriculum with limited resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS: ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Recorder: Mike Jenkins

Following first session discussion of four particular areas of management (staffing, time management, staff development, and recruitment and promotion), the second session centered around problems concerned with instruction and staff evaluation, part-time faculty and salary policies and procedures.

It was recommended that:

1. Merit pay procedures be related to faculty evaluation systems.

2. Part-time teaching faculty be clearly identified as part-time to avoid misunderstandings regarding benefits, tenure, assignment and expectations. Contracts for part-time faculty should be specific and clear.

3. Colleges should establish faculty evaluation systems for part-time faculty.

4. Small colleges should study compensation for management personnel with consideration for tasks to be accomplished rather than size alone.

5. Small colleges should work toward faculty rank and salary systems which give favorable consideration to faculty with multi-discipline preparation. (Two master's degrees as the equivalent of one year past the master's).

6. Graduate schools should be encouraged to become aware of peculiar needs of small/rural community colleges - especially needs for multiple competencies - and prepare personnel accordingly.

7. Policy makers, at local state and federal levels, should be made more aware of the increasing migration of the population from urban to rural areas. Such information should be pointed toward needs for college expansion in those areas.

8. Small colleges should work with other colleges, including those in large urban areas to develop cooperative/interinstitutional programs.

9. Faculty exchange between all colleges rural-rural, rural-urban, etc. should be explored as a means for sharing information.

10. Small/rural colleges should be provided information regarding:
    a. Faculty evaluation programs
    b. Formulas for faculty load
    c. Formulas for setting equitable salaries.

11. Small/rural colleges should seek the development of differential funding patterns which give consideration to peculiar needs of those colleges (i.e. overhead, program costs, base costs for

minimum facilities, maintenance and administration).

12. Small/rural colleges should maximize the use of community resources to eliminate or reduce program costs and unwarranted duplication of programs, staffing, and facilities.

DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INITIATING AND MAINTAINING COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN SMALL/RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Don G. Creamer
Debbie L. Floyd
Constance D. Sutton

Recorder: Debbie L. Floyd

It was recommended that:

1. Investigations be initiated to understand better the generalist role of student services personnel in small/rural community colleges,

2. Student needs assessments be given priority attention by student service personnel,

3. Stronger synergistic roles be developed between community agencies and small/rural community colleges with the intent of pooling resources for maximizing learning opportunities for students,

4. High priority be given to creating strategies to insure equal opportunities for small/rural community college students to experience cultural development,

5. Investigations be initiated to determine adequate staffing levels of student services in small/rural community colleges,

6. Priority be given to the interchange of ideas and other forms of communication relative to programs and practices among small/rural community colleges.

7. Practioners, researchers and others who have access to materials on concerns of small/rural community college student services should share them through more effective utilization of available resources such as the ERIC Clearinghouses,

8. Research be initiated to create a document that would provide a national comparative base for small/rural community college student services. Individual colleges should be able to compare their staff assignments, funding practices, staff preparation, and organizational relationships with other American small/rural community colleges.

9. Research should be initiated on the variables related to institutional smallness that have an impact on the development of students,

10. Attention should be given to the creation of incentives for small/rural community college faculty to be encouraged to participate more directly in: a) planned institutional change, and b) collaborative ventures with other college personnel in extra-curricular and co-curricular programs and activities,

11. Alternatives to traditional in service or staff development activities be found. For example, it was suggested that colleges encourage the exchange of personnel on short term arrangements as an alternative to sending personnel to conferences,

12. The Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges sponsor another conference similar to this conference but with greater specificity regarding the sharing of specific program ideas and activities of individual small/rural community colleges, and

13. The Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges be given permanent status within the A.A.C.J.C. structure and that A.A.C.J.C. continue support of commission activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS: COMMUNITY SERVICES

Recorder: Rex Bishop

We recommend that small, rural community colleges do the following:

1. Request that a more serious commitment and allocation of resources be given to community services at the state-wide and national levels; specifically, that priority be given for use of Title I funds at small/rural community colleges.

2. Investigate the feasibility of re-aligning personnel and other resources to facilitate the operation of community services programs.

   a. Non-teaching services should be available to all students during appropriate hours whether these students are credit, non-credit, day or night students.

   b. Equal recognition should be given to CEU, non-CEU, and credit offerings.

3. An institute should be established to study the unique needs of small/rural community colleges in the following areas:

   a. Speical skills needed to operate community service programs

   b. Assessment of community needs and resources

   c. Methods of articulation

   d. Types of delivery systems

   e. Dissemination of information

4. Programs for orientation, utilization, and evaluatio of adjunct faculty be given consideration for funding.

   a. These programs should emphasize the "ruralness" of programs and students.

   b. Attention should be given to reviewing present programs and establishing systematic future planning.

5. Manpower and other usable data should be made applicable at the local as well as the state-wide level.

6. Funding should be made available for community development activities in the form of block grants which do not specify required levels of enrollment in their activities.

7. Universities should direct dissertation topics addressing the problems and concerns of small/rural community colleges.

8. Universities should explore possible graduate student internship assignments at small/rural community colleges.

RECOMMENDATIONS: FINANCING SMALL/RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Recorder: Rex Bishop

We recommend that small, rural community colleges do the following:

1. Investigate and utilize all sources possible to obtain the funding necessary to provide a comprehensive educational program.

   a. Institutions should join together to take advantage of the private and federal funding now available.

   b. Each institution should create a resource development plan to assist in pursuing funding and in working with legislative and executive branches of government.

2. To avoid duplication of effort, associate degree programs should be primarily the province of two-year institutions.

3. Small/rural community colleges should be the primary training locations for federal job-related programs such as CETA. This would increase the use of existing facilities for these programs and reduce the need for creating new facilities.

4. Develop a nationwide research data base for small/rural community colleges.

   a. Use this base to show the uniqueness of small/rural community colleges.

   b. Disseminate this data widely to institutions.

5. Work with the legislative and executive branches of government to demonstrate the uniqueness of needs for small/rural community colleges.

   a. To accomplish the above, the Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges should sponsor national and/or regional workshops and other means of information dissemination to train local community college personnel to properly communicate Small/rural community college needs to government officials.

6. Funding formulas should be developed to reflect fixed costs at differing institutions.

   a. Display the need for minimum, basic facilities to maintain comprehensiveness.
   b. Investigate the development of improved staffing formulas.
   c. These funding formulas should reflect the differences between urban and rural institutions.

7. Develop a plan to interpret the attractions of rural life (i.e., the idea that rural is good).

RECOMMENDATIONS: STATE COORDINATION AND CONTROL

Recorder: Rex Bishop

We recommend that small/rural community colleges do the following:

1. Encourage state coordinating agencies to hire personnel whose backgrounds and experience enables them to understand the unique problems and concerns of small/rural community colleges.

2. Develop an exchange program between state department personnel and local community college personnel.

3. Solicit a clarification of mission for state department offices, commissions and agencies.

4. Encourage coordinating agencies to recognize the unique service area needs of small/rural community colleges such as the minimum, basic requirements for staffing and facilities to maintain comprehensive services.

5. Encourage state department agencies to develop a central data source to reduce duplication of data gathering.

6. Encourage research dealing with the effects of leadership styles on state coordination and control agencies.

7. Encourage the coordinating bodies to examine the curricula at individual institutions to insure the proper balance between liberal arts, occupational/technical and community service programs at each individual institution.

8. Encourage the Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges to examine models for developing and utilizing grass roots constituencies to communicate the concerns and problems of small/rural community colleges to the legislative and executive branches of government.

9. Encourage the Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges to develop a regional consortia to address the needs and problems of small/rural community colleges.

10. Encourage the Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges to present the recommendations of this conference to state level officials at their regularly scheduled meetings.

11. Encourage increased communication between state level officials of different states.

12. Investigate methods for developing interagency cooperative arrangements to assist small/rural community colleges.

13 Emphasize that state coordinating and control agencies use more coordination, less control, and exercise a greater leadership role in legislative liaison activities.

14. Encourage regulatory and coordinating agencies to use independent agencies to evaluate their audit and information requirements to determine it these requirements are cost effective and to recommend procedures for improving cost effectiveness. (e.g. Additional information requirements should not be instituted until a plan or proposal has been developed displaying how the information will be used in making decisions and the benefits that will be realized in relationship to the total costs of gathering the information.)

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Facilitators: Connie Sutton, Bill Armfield

Recorder: Mike Jenkins

It is recommended that:

1. AACJC encourage the state levels to become more aware of the need to fund staff development on the local levels.

2. AACJC encourage the state levels to fund development.

3. AACJC make available information concerning staff development techniques that are currently being used, specifically in rural community colleges.

4. AACJC continue and improve support for staff development.

5. Commission on Small Rural Community Colleges be upgraded to council status . . . and with membership dues required.

6. Rural community colleges become more aware of their uniqueness and recognize that creative solutions of problems must come from within the institution.

7. That rural community college administrators investigate the motivation or lack of motivation of faculty members to become involved with staff development, specifically travel, workshops, visitations, etc.

8. That the meaning of "Staff devlopment" be questioned - are new experiences to be included in the meaning of staff development; i.e., staff and faculty picnic, parties, etc.

9. Community college personnel with writing ability be encouraged to publish.

CURRICULUM CONPREHENSIVENESS

Facilitators: Dr. George B. Vaughan
Dr. Chester H. Gausman

Recorder: Mike Jenkins

The first topic discussed dealt with obtaining educational materials needed for self-paced instruction. How can the small colleges obtain these materials at reasonable costs? One approach is to make these materials locally. An alternative argument is that this approach "re-invents the wheel" -- the colleges need some way to get started. Prepared materials provide that start, they can be modified to better suit specific college needs over time. The development costs of self-paced materials vary widely. Of course the one costs related to the additional equipment needed (AV, cameras, etc.) but there are other costs avoided; with individualized instruction often only one piece of expensive equipment is needed for instructional purposes instead of many.

Another area discussed involved how open entry - open exit works. The student signs up for a course in a way similar to one's making a purchase with a charge-a-plate. The computer prints out a weekly report on who is taking what subjects - credit is awarded as the subjects are completed. In one case, FTE funding from the state is based on the total FTE generated for the previous year.

The possibilities of sharing resources between large and small colleges was discussed. Dr. Vaughan cautioned that the small colleges must received credit for the FTE they generate in such cooperative ventures while TV studios are extremely costly (and possibly a waste of money) it is possible for a college to work constructively in cooperation with the PBS Ferrum college is working with the PBS in the production of programs on the Humanities and on Public Policy.

In the area of grants the importance of gaining a reputation for success was stressed. An alternative point was made by Dr. Gausman, the lack of initiation is the greatest obstacle to innovation -- not the lack of funds.

The final part of the discussion centered around making the information on what is going on in the small/rural field available to interested institutions. There appears to be a strong need for more publication -- greater information sharing.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the educational materials for self-paced individualized instruction produced by grant efforts be made available to small colleges at cost (rather than paying the mark-ups imposed by the larger institutions that develop those materials). There is a parallel need for the institutions that have such materials to share them - and make their availability known.
2. That the commission encourage ways to provide incentives for cooperation and resource sharing between institutions. For example, large and small community colleges might share resources during slack periods. A sensitivity to this type approach in Washington, D. C. and in the states would facilitate progress toward resource sharing.
3. AACJC should be encouraged to provide the commission with a way to get information out to the interested institutions -- both large and small. Possibly, the commission should be elevated to council status. There should be more publications related to the small/rural institutions.
4. A list of consultants available to assist small/rural institutions should be prepared by the commission.

SESSION: Developing Recommendations for Research in Small/Rural Colleges

Facilitators: Dr. Arthur Cohen, ERIC
Dr. Robert G. Templin, UVA

Recorder: Mr. F. S. Blackburn, Hagerstown Jr. College

Sincere concern was expressed over the need for more and more specifically directed research as it applies to both the small and rural colleges. A primary question was exactly what research was to be done, and secondly, who was to conduct the research. Since most small/rural colleges do not have the financial strength to permit the fully developed institutional research unit, it is necessary that someone else do the research. Several recommendations follow-up on this point.

The participants in the workshop session made a number of viable recommendations, which are captured below. These represent the essence of the recommendations. For sake of clarity, duplications have been reduced. The order is NOT representative of priority.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. At present there is a dearth of research literature on and for the small/rural colleges. This situation should be examined, and rectified.

2. During the elimination of the problem stated in #1 above (dearth) it should be noted that several participants suggested that emphasis be placed on developing literature for rural rather than small colleges. This was based on the existence of a large bibliography which is now available on small colleges. Also, it was noted that the small college is a vanishing institution - that is small colleges are becoming bigger. It was suggested that rural colleges represent the last real minority.

3. Concern was expressed over the funding bases for small and rural colleges. If some formula method is used, minor reductions in student FTE's causes drastic conditions. On the other hand, it was noted that this entire aspect is a legislative/political concern.

4. Following the report that there is a distinct dichtomy between the colleges which offer extensive services to full-time students and to part-time students, there should be increased focus on the process of getting more full-time students. Also, getting part-timers to full time status where possible.

5. An issue raised dealt with the impact of size on economies of scale- If one were to overview small/rural colleges, it would become obvious that most at administratively top-heavy. This situation could be explored, with one possible conclusion being that the small/rural administrator is involved with a wide range of activities not undertaken by large college administrators.

6. Many small/rural schools feel the strong need to complete follow-up studies, but do not have the expertise of financial ability to do so. It was discussed that ERIC could provide the expertise, once a "researcher" has been identified. (See following recommendation for researcher).

7. One study identified for possible undertaking was a comparative study on the "success" of small/rural graduates versus graduates from a large college. Also, it was suggested that another, or the same study could focus on resident versus commuter graduate success.

8. A prime interest was the development of a data base, both demographic and quantitive, on the attributes of small/rural colleges; students. faculty programs, etc. It would enable partitioning on any number of aspects: i.e., rural vs. small, and the overall data base would enable comparisions on a variety of parameters. It was pointed out that serveral studies along these lines do exist (Cross and Rouche) but that they have not been partitioned along these particular lines.

9. Comparision is an important activity for small/rural college administrators. This so since it provides measures which are readily available. The above #8 mentioned data base would provide the necessary information.

10. ERIC has current data available for use by administrators; Faculty, curriculum, etc. The data has been collected over a wide range of institutions. Facilitation of the collection of same data at the particular institution is rather simple; using ERIC supplied information.

11. Research should be done to determine exactly what job markets will be open to the graduates of two-year small/rural colleges. This should be available for both the immediate (one to three years) and long terms (five to ten years). As an integral part of this information, there should be directions on just who wil be in need of re-training to permit re-entry or new entry into the contemporary job markets. The job market is constantly changing; requiring high regard of colleges.

12. Interest was expressed in the avilability of nationally developed costs. This would provide yet another basis for comparing institutions. This information should be available in small and/or rural partitioning, providing an administrator to compare to similarily situated institutions.

13. High feelings concerning the futuristic alternative development was expressed. Several examples included what IF gasoline prices go to $1.00 or what IF utility costs increase by 20%, or what IF main source funding is reduced by X%. What will be the outcomes and how could the colleges react.

14. It was suggested that a compiled source document of research on small/rural colleges be made available, identifying what has been done, and further how colleges could conduct research on their own. This latter point would provide in-house data for comparison to other institutions, and for use as a decision making process.

15. It was noted that although a number of "isms" (sexism, racism) have been reduced or eliminated, impact of urban faculty on rural students should be assessed. In fact, all instructor attitudes should be assessed.

16. If researchers are to explore questions posed by small/rural colleges, the colleges must express these questions.

17. If research is to be conducted, it will be necessary to eventually determine if the problems unique to small/rural colleges are indeed unique to only small and rural colleges, or if they are evident at all institutions of higher education.

18. A prime source of research ability is the doctoral student. If research is to be conducted, it could well be done by grad students as part of dissertations or other grad studies. Some inroads have been made into this area, however, much remains to be done throughtout the field.

19. If research is to be of value, then it must answer questions which need to be answered, not merely support some known conclusion or decision.

20. If student flow-through studies are to be conducted, they must be done on an on-going basis, not as an ex-post-facto endeavor. The student should be sampled in the first few weeks of their first term, beginning of the second term, etc.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND THE RURAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Prepared by the AACJC Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges

One of the fundamental philosophical tenets upon which the American democracy is founded is that of equal opportunity. Our political philosophy, economic system, and social institutions are predicated on this basic value. Throughout the two hundred years of the nation's history, the meaning of equal opportunity has been expanded by legal and extra-legal changes. Because equality of educational opportunity is necessary for individuals to attain their goals in life, it is incumbent upon a democratic society to place opportunities for postsecondary education within reach of all regardless of socioeconomic status, ethnicity, or other circumstance--including the density of population in a geographic area.

People living in rural areas are often denied higher education opportunities simply because they are not near a college or there are not enough people to justify expensive programs. Examinations of the enrollments of community colleges reveal a predominance of local students. Research shows that enrollments steadily decline as the distance from a community college campus increases and few students live more than 50 miles from the community college they attend. It has also been shown that the percentage of high school graduates living in the vicinity of a community college who go to college is higher than in areas where there is no community college.

Public policy-making bodies of each state, e.g. coordinating boards, public planning agencies, legislatures, and others, must face squarely the conflict between the fundamental right to educational opportunity and the limited resources which are available, or may be made available, for implementing the principle at the postsecondary level.

Members of the AACJC Commission on Small/Rural Community Colleges believe that many public bodies having this responsibility have not provided equal educational opportunity and in some cases have made only a superficial effort. Some have met the issue with policy statements paying lip service to the principle of bringing equal educational opportunities beyond high school within reach of each citizen but have failed to establish a viable system of implementation. Still other have established a delivery system compatible with a goal, but left barriers and hazards preventing its functioning properly.

The Commission holds that there should be equal educational opportunity for those living in less populated areas, and that the rural community college is a vital component. The Commission declares that it is in the public interest that rural community colleges maintain comprehensive curricula and programs of services, even though these may cost more per person served.

The Commission adopted the following principle and recommends that it be promulgated broadly to public boards and agencies, legislatures, and the Congress, and in various AACJC publications. The principle is stated:

> Equal educational opportunity requires that public policy-making bodies provide for comprehensiveness in curriculum and in services in all community college systems regardless of size or geographic location.

The community college represents a unique American effort to democratize higher education. This assumes, as did Thomas Jefferson, that education is necessary to the preservation of democracy, that education has a principal role in societal change, and that the role of education in upward social mobility helps to equalize opportunities for all. Therefore, the community college is a basic and necessary instrument of a democratic government that wants to assure equal opportunities for all citizens.

Adopted December, 1977

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 6 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES